



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/767,793

01/23/2001

Tim Carruthers

109.635.128

2247

44367

7590

06/01/2005

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A./OPTV
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938

EXAMINER

CHAMPAGNE, DONALD

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/767,793

Applicant(s)

CARRUTHERS ET AL.

Examiner

Donald L. Champagne

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 15-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

W

DETAILED ACTION

Incomplete Information Disclosure Statements

1. The Office's records show that information disclosure statements were filed on 3 August 2001, 26 February 2002, 13 November 2002 and 5 April 2004. However, no form PTO-1449 or other listing of the filed information has been made of record. Hence these four IDS fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1). Applicant may submit forms PTO-1449 for each of the four IDS, without the payment of additional fees or filing a statement in accordance with 37 CFR 1.97(e), provided that said submission is done in response to this Office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed with an amendment on 8 November 2004 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the following new basis of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 2, 25, 43 and 60-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the remainder of the claims, does not reasonably provide enablement for the subject claims. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

For claims 2, 25, 43, 65 and 66, there is no enablement for "known behavior of individual users", i.e., there is no disclosure as to how said behavior is known.

For claims 60-68, there is no enablement for determining an expected number of deliveries based on the expected position.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-13 and 15-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Dimitriadis et al. (US005664949A) in view of March et al. (US005848397A).
7. Dimitriadis et al. teaches (independent claims 1, 24, 38, 39, 42 and 56) a method and system for scheduling the delivery of multiple items/advertisements, the method comprising: generating an ordered master list (*a sequence of index values*, col. 5 line 11) of the advertisement items to be selectively delivered to the user, said ordered list being prioritized to meet delivery requirements associated with said advertisement items (the *conditions* in *conditions list 400b*, col. 5 line 66 to col. 6 line 5; see also col. 2 lines 3-11, col. 3 lines 29-30, col. 4 lines 24-26 and 40-41 and col. 5 lines 1-12); dynamically generating an individual list of items (the *queue of associated records 400 for presentation*, col. 9 lines 3-4 in col. 8 line 59 to col. 9 line 5) to be delivered to each user on user login (when *information device 40*, col. 4 lines 1-8, is on), said individual list specifying items of content that said user is eligible to receive based on user profile data and in an order in accordance with said ordered master list, and delivering to each logged on user items of advertising content specified in the user's individual list.
8. Dimitriadis et al. does not teach determining expected values relating to each user being online during a given time period and generating the ordered list based on said expected values. March et al. teaches determining expected values relating to each user *viewing advertising* during a given time period (col. 15 lines 60-61) and generating the ordered list based on said expected values, where the ordered list is defined by the *weighting constants* c_1, c_2, \dots of the *weighted scheduling criteria* (col. 4 lines 7-15, col. 10 lines 29-38 and col. 13 lines 8-18). Because March et al. teaches a simple means of weighted multiple criteria, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of March et al. with those of Dimitriadis et al. Also, by the following

Art Unit: 3622

interpretation of the term "being online", said user *viewing advertising* reads on said user "being online".

9. Unless a term is given a "clear definition" in the specification (MPEP § 2111.01), the examiner is obligated to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, in light of the specification, and consistent with the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach (MPEP § 2111). An inventor may define specific terms used to describe invention, but must do so "with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision" (MPEP § 2111.01.III). A "clear definition" must establish the metes and bounds of the terms. A clear definition must unambiguously establish what is and what is not included. A clear definition is indicated by a section labeled definitions, or by the use of phrases such as "by xxx we mean"; "xxx is defined as"; or "xxx includes, ... but does not include ...".
10. The instant application contains no such clear definition for the phrase "being online". Hence, the examiner is required to give the phrase its broadest reasonable interpretation, which the examiner judges to "served by or available through a system" (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary). The user's action in March et al. reads on that.
11. Dimitriadis et al. also teaches at the citations given above claims 5, 6, 8-11, 15, 21, 28, 30, 46, 48, 51 and 57.
12. Marsh et al. also teaches claims 2, 25 and 43 (col. 15 lines 57-60); claims 3, 4, 26, 27, 44 and 45, where the probability of each user being online is unity (para. 9-10 above); claims 12, 13, 20, 31, 32, 37, 49, 50, 55, 58 and 59 (col. 3 line 66 to col. 4 line 2); claims 16, 17, 33, 34, 52 and 53 (col. 7 lines 66-67, where *showcase* reads on pop-up); claims 18, 35 and 54 (col. 4 lines 29-39); claim 22, where the *partial ordering* (col. 4 lines 7-17 and col. 10 line 53 to col. 12 line 2); claim 23, where the variable c_4 : *percent remaining exposures* (col. 9 line 47 and col. 10 line 38) is 1 minus the ratio of deliveries to desired deliveries; and claims 36, 40 and 41 (col. 2 lines 26-28).
13. Neither reference teaches (claims 7, 29 and 47) that said ordered (master) list is generated daily. Because Dimitriadis et al. teaches that it is desirable to download the list at night (col. 6 lines 28-29), Marsh et al. suggests frequent updating of the ad stock (col. 2 lines 52-54) and the user device is likely to be used daily, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to add to the teachings of Dimitriadis et al. and Marsh et al. that said ordered (master) list is generated daily.

Art Unit: 3622

14. Claims 60-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over March et al.
15. March et al. teaches (independent claim 60) a method of determining the viability of a proposed plan to deliver an item of advertising content to online users, the method comprising: determining an expected position of the based on the time period between deliveries (col. 9 line 46), and comparing the expected number of deliveries to the specified number of deliveries (i.e., computing the ratio *pre*, col. 9 line 47).
16. March et al. does not teach determining expected values relating to each user being online during a given time period and generating the ordered list based on said expected values. March et al. teaches determining expected values relating to each user *viewing advertising* during a given time period (col. 15 lines 60-61) and generating the ordered list based on said expected values, where the ordered list is defined by the *weighting constants* c_1, c_2, \dots of the *weighted scheduling criteria* (col. 4 lines 7-15, col. 10 lines 29-38 and col. 13 lines 8-18). Because March et al. teaches a simple means of weighted multiple criteria, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of March et al. with those of Dimitriadis et al. Also,
17. March et al. does not explicitly teach that said expected number of deliveries is based on the expected position. However, under the principles of inherency (MPEP § 2112.02), since the reference invention necessarily performs the method claimed, the method claimed is considered to be anticipated by the reference invention. As evidence tending to show inherency, it is noted, first, that said expected (desired) number of user deliveries is clearly dependent on the number of (online) users having the specified characteristics and the number of users with online access, which reads on users that will be online during the specified period.

Allowable Subject Matter

18. Claim 14 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would likely be allowable (see para. 17 below) if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
19. The examiner does not search individual dependent claims in the non-patent literature until applicant has put them into condition for allowance. Allowance is further dependent on successful vetting by a "second pair of eyes".

Art Unit: 3622

Conclusion

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L Champagne whose telephone number is 571-272-6717. The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 5 PM ET, Monday to Thursday. The examiner can also be contacted by e-mail at donald.champagne@uspto.gov, and *informal* fax communications (i.e., communications not to be made of record) may be sent directly to the examiner at 571-273-6717.
21. The examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on 571-272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
22. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).
23. **ABANDONMENT** – If examiner cannot by telephone verify applicant's intent to continue prosecution, the application is subject to abandonment six months after mailing of the last Office action. The agent, attorney or applicant point of contact is responsible for assuring that the Office has their telephone number. Agents and attorneys may verify their registration information including telephone number at the Office's web site, www.uspto.gov. At the top of the home page, click on Site Index. Then click on Agent & Attorney Roster in the alphabetic list, and search for your registration by your name or number.

DONALD L. CHAMPAGNE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Donald L. Champagne
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

26 May 2005